

## 2018 Current Fiscal Year Report: National Institute of Mental Health Initial Review Group

Report Run Date: 06/05/2019 11:47:19 AM

### 1. Department or Agency

Department of Health and Human Services

### 2. Fiscal Year

2018

### 3. Committee or Subcommittee

National Institute of Mental Health Initial Review Group

### 3b. GSA Committee No.

1957

### 4. Is this New During Fiscal Year?

No

### 5. Current Charter

09/30/1994

### 6. Expected Renewal Date

### 7. Expected Term Date

### 8a. Was Terminated During Fiscal Year?

No

### 8b. Specific Termination Authority

### 8c. Actual Term Date

### 9. Agency Recommendation for Next Fiscal Year

Continue

### 10a. Legislation Req to Terminate?

Not Applicable

### 10b. Legislation Pending?

Not Applicable

### 11. Establishment Authority

Authorized by Law

### 12. Specific Establishment Authority

42 USC 282(b)(16)

### 13. Effective Date

11/20/1985

### 14. Committee Type

Continuing

### 14c. Presidential?

No

### 15. Description of Committee

Grant Review Committee

### 16a. Total Number of Reports

No Reports for this Fiscal Year

### 17a. Open Meetings and Dates 0 17b. Closed Meetings and Dates 3 17c. Partially Closed Meetings and Dates 0 17d. Total Meetings and Dates 3

#### Purpose

NIH Peer Review

#### Start

10/30/2017

#### End

- 10/30/2017

NIH Peer Review

03/07/2018

- 03/07/2018

NIH Peer Review

06/12/2018

- 06/12/2018

### Number of Committee Meetings Listed: 3

	Current FY	Next FY
18a(1). Personnel Pmts to Non-Federal Members	\$17,200.00	\$17,200.00
18a(2). Personnel Pmts to Federal Members	\$0.00	\$0.00
18a(3). Personnel Pmts to Federal Staff	\$119,015.00	\$121,276.00
18a(4). Personnel Pmts to Non-Member Consultants	\$0.00	\$0.00
18b(1). Travel and Per Diem to Non-Federal Members	\$43,341.00	\$44,129.00
18b(2). Travel and Per Diem to Federal Members	\$0.00	\$0.00
18b(3). Travel and Per Diem to Federal Staff	\$0.00	\$0.00
18b(4). Travel and Per Diem to Non-member Consultants	\$0.00	\$0.00
18c. Other(rents,user charges, graphics, printing, mail, etc.)	\$11,479.00	\$11,708.00

<b>18d. Total</b>	\$191,035.00	\$194,313.00
<b>19. Federal Staff Support Years (FTE)</b>	0.80	0.80

**20a. How does the Committee accomplish its purpose?**

This committee is composed of recognized biomedical and/or behavioral research authorities who represent the forefront of research and technical knowledge and who provide first-level merit review of highly scientific and technical research grant applications in the fields of mental health and mental disorders, mental health treatment interventions and services. During this reporting period the committee reviewed 106 applications requesting \$88,629,030 in total direct costs for all years.

**20b. How does the Committee balance its membership?**

This committee is composed of members who are authorities knowledgeable in the fields relating to the design and evaluation of the efficacy, effectiveness, and/or safety of various treatment interventions for mental disorders and the delivery of mental health services.

**20c. How frequent and relevant are the Committee Meetings?**

This committee held 3 meetings during this reporting period.

**20d. Why can't the advice or information this committee provides be obtained elsewhere?**

This committee is composed of recognized biomedical and/or behavioral research authorities who represent the forefront of research and technical knowledge and who provide first-level merit review of highly scientific and technical research grant applications. These evaluations and recommendations cannot be obtained from other sources because the specialized, complex nature of the applications requires a unique balance and breadth of expertise not available on the NIH staff or from other established sources.

**20e. Why is it necessary to close and/or partially closed committee meetings?**

The meetings of the committee were closed to the public for the review of grant applications. Sections 552b(c)(4) and 552b(c)(6) of the Government in the Sunshine Act permit the closing of meetings where discussion could reveal confidential trade secrets or commercial property such as patentable material and personal information, the disclosure of which would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy.

**21. Remarks**

Reports: This committee did not produce any public reports during the fiscal year. Dr. Jean Noronha is both the DFO and the Committee Decision Maker for the NIMH Initial

Review Group based on the assignment of duties in this Institute. Zip Codes: Due to the large number of members associated with this committee, NIH staff are unable to provide individual zip codes for all members. Current individual meeting rosters, including zip codes are available on line at <https://public.era.nih.gov/pubroster/>.

## Designated Federal Officer

Jean G. Noronha Director, Division of Extramural Activities

Committee Members	Start	End	Occupation	Member Designation
AARONS, GREGORY	03/07/2018	03/07/2018	PROFESSOR	Peer Review Consultant Member
ANDOVER, MARGARET	10/30/2017	10/30/2017	ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR	Peer Review Consultant Member
BELLAMY, CHYRELL	03/07/2018	03/07/2018	ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR	Peer Review Consultant Member
BOYD, RHONDA	03/07/2018	03/07/2018	ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR	Peer Review Consultant Member
BRANSON, CHRISTOPHER	10/30/2017	10/30/2017	ASSISTANT PROFESSOR	Peer Review Consultant Member
CHAN, EUGENIA	06/12/2018	06/12/2018	ASSISTANT PROFESSOR	Peer Review Consultant Member
CHAPMAN, WENDY	06/12/2018	06/12/2018	PROFESSOR	Peer Review Consultant Member
CHILDRESS, DEBRA	03/07/2018	03/07/2018	SENIOR RESEARCH ASSOCIATE	Peer Review Consultant Member
CHISOLM, DEENA	03/07/2018	03/07/2018	ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR	Peer Review Consultant Member
COHEN, DEBORAH	07/21/2017	06/30/2020	ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR	Peer Review Consultant Member
COHEN, TREVOR	03/07/2018	03/07/2018	ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR	Peer Review Consultant Member
COLES, MEREDITH	10/30/2017	10/30/2017	PROFESSOR	Peer Review Consultant Member
COMER, JONATHAN	06/12/2018	06/12/2018	PROFESSOR	Peer Review Consultant Member
COOK, BENJAMIN	07/28/2017	06/30/2020	DIRECTOR	Peer Review Consultant Member
DANIEL, STEPHANIE	06/12/2018	06/12/2018	PROFESSOR, VICE CHAIR FOR RESEARCH	Peer Review Consultant Member
DAVIS, MARYANN	06/12/2018	06/12/2018	RESEARCH ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR	Peer Review Consultant Member
DE CHOUDHURY, MUNMUN	06/12/2018	06/12/2018	ASSISTANT PROFESSOR	Peer Review Consultant Member
DEROSIER, MELISSA	10/30/2017	10/30/2017	PRESIDENT AND DIRECTOR	Peer Review Consultant Member
DOSREIS, SUSAN	07/20/2017	06/30/2020	PROFESSOR	Peer Review Consultant Member
DUPAUL, GEORGE	06/12/2018	06/12/2018	PROFESSOR	Peer Review Consultant Member
EIRALDI, RICARDO	10/30/2017	10/30/2017	ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR OF CLINICAL PSYCHOLOGY IN PEDIATRICS AND PSYCHIATRY	Peer Review Consultant Member
EISENBERG, DANIEL	07/01/2015	06/30/2018	S.J. AXELROD COLLEGIATE PROFESSOR	Peer Review Consultant Member

FELTON, MICHELE	07/26/2017 06/30/2020 PROGRAM COODINATOR	Peer Review Consultant Member
FREY, JODI	06/12/2018 06/12/2018 ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR	Peer Review Consultant Member
GOLBERSTEIN, EZRA	03/07/2018 03/07/2018 ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR	Peer Review Consultant Member
HAN, SUSAN	10/30/2017 10/30/2017 RESEARCH ASSOCIATE	Peer Review Consultant Member
HARVEY, PHILIP	03/07/2018 03/07/2018 PROFESSOR	Peer Review Consultant Member
HERSCHELL, AMY	07/01/2015 06/30/2018 ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR	Peer Review Consultant Member
HUYBRECHTS, KRISTA	03/07/2018 03/07/2018 ASSISTANT PROFESSOR OF MEDICINE	Peer Review Consultant Member
JARAD, SAMAH	03/07/2018 03/07/2018 ASSISTANT PROFESSOR	Peer Review Consultant Member
LANDA, YULIA	03/07/2018 03/07/2018 ASSISTANT PROFESSOR	Peer Review Consultant Member
LANDES, SARA	06/12/2018 06/12/2018 CLINICAL PSYCHOLOGIST	Peer Review Consultant Member
LENZE, SHANNON	10/30/2017 10/30/2017 ASSISTANT PROFESSOR	Peer Review Consultant Member
LEROY, GONDY	06/12/2018 06/12/2018 ELLER FELLOW AND ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR OF MIS,	Peer Review Consultant Member
LOPEZ, MOLLY	06/12/2018 06/12/2018 RESEARCH ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR	Peer Review Consultant Member
MCREYNOLDS, LARKIN	03/07/2018 03/07/2018 ASSISTANT PROFESSOR	Peer Review Consultant Member
MEREDITH, LISA	03/07/2018 03/07/2018 SENIOR BEHAVIORAL SCIENTIST	Peer Review Consultant Member
MORALES, KNASHAWN	07/26/2017 06/30/2020 ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR OF BIOSTATISTICS	Peer Review Consultant Member
MULVEY, EDWARD	10/30/2017 10/30/2017 PROFESSOR	Peer Review Consultant Member
ODOM, SAMUEL	06/12/2018 06/12/2018 DIRECTOR	Peer Review Consultant Member
PENFOLD, ROBERT	10/30/2017 10/30/2017 ASSOCIATE SCIENTIFIC INVESTIGATOR	Peer Review Consultant Member
PFEIFFER, PAUL	03/07/2018 03/07/2018 ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR OF PSYCHIATRY	Peer Review Consultant Member
POLLIO, DAVID	03/07/2018 03/07/2018 DISTINGUISHED PROFESSOR AND CHAIR	Peer Review Consultant Member
RANNEY, MEGAN	03/07/2018 03/07/2018 ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR	Peer Review Consultant Member
RENDO, JACQUELINE	07/20/2017 06/30/2018 DIRECTOR	Peer Review Consultant Member
RICHARDSON, LAURA	03/07/2018 03/07/2018 ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR	Peer Review Consultant Member
ROBERTSON, ALLISON	03/07/2018 03/07/2018 ASSISTANT PROFESSOR	Peer Review Consultant Member
SALZER, MARK	07/01/2016 06/30/2019 PROFESSOR AND CHAIR	Peer Review Consultant Member
SCHIFFMAN, JASON	03/07/2018 03/07/2018 PROFESSOR	Peer Review Consultant Member
SIDDIQUE, JUNED	07/05/2016 06/29/2019 ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR	Peer Review Consultant Member
SLEATH, BETSY	07/28/2017 06/30/2020 GEORGE H COCOLAS DISTINGUISHED PROFESSOR AND CHAIR	Peer Review Consultant Member

SMITH, MATTHEW	03/07/2018	03/07/2018	ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR OF SOCIAL WORK	Peer Review Consultant Member
SMITH, TRISTRAM	03/07/2018	03/07/2018	PROFESSOR	Peer Review Consultant Member
SOUTHAM-GEROW, MICHAEL	03/07/2018	03/07/2018	PROFESSOR	Peer Review Consultant Member
SRIHARI, VINOD	07/01/2015	06/30/2018	ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR	Peer Review Consultant Member
STAHMER, AUBYN	07/01/2016	06/01/2019	ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR	Peer Review Consultant Member
STUART, ELIZABETH	07/25/2017	06/30/2019	PROFESSOR	Peer Review Consultant Member
STUART, SCOTT	03/07/2018	03/07/2018	PROFESSOR	Peer Review Consultant Member
SUBICA, ANDREW	06/12/2018	06/12/2018	ASSISTANT PROFESSOR IN RESIDENCE	Peer Review Consultant Member
TILFORD, JOHN	03/07/2018	03/07/2018	PROFESSOR AND CHAIR	Peer Review Consultant Member
TOHEN, MAURICIO	10/30/2017	10/30/2017	CHAIR AND PROFESSOR	Peer Review Consultant Member
WEINSTOCK, LAUREN	06/12/2018	06/12/2018	ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR	Peer Review Consultant Member
WEXLER, LISA	10/30/2017	10/30/2017	ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR	Peer Review Consultant Member
YARBOROUGH, BOBBIJO	03/07/2018	03/07/2018	INVESTIGATOR	Peer Review Consultant Member
YOUNG, ALEXANDER	07/20/2016	06/30/2019	PROFESSOR	Peer Review Consultant Member

**Number of Committee Members Listed: 65**

### **Narrative Description**

The goal of NIH research is to acquire new knowledge to help prevent, detect, diagnose, and treat disease and disability, from the rarest genetic disorder to the common cold. The NIH mission is to uncover new knowledge that will lead to better health for everyone. NIH works toward that mission by supporting the research of non-Federal scientists in universities, medical schools, hospitals, and research institutions throughout the country and abroad. Section 492 of the PHS Act states that the Secretary...shall by regulation require appropriate technical and scientific peer review of - (A)applications...; and (B)biomedical and behavioral research and development contracts... The mission of the National Institute of Mental Health (NIMH) Initial Review Group (IRG), as authorized by law, is to review grant and cooperative agreement applications for research and research training activities that focus on scientific areas relevant to mental health and mental disorders. During this reporting period the committee reviewed 106 applications requesting \$88,629,030 in total direct costs for all years.

**What are the most significant program outcomes associated with this committee?**

Checked if Applies

Improvements to health or safety	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Trust in government	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Major policy changes	<input type="checkbox"/>
Advance in scientific research	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Effective grant making	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Improved service delivery	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Increased customer satisfaction	<input type="checkbox"/>
Implementation of laws or regulatory requirements	<input type="checkbox"/>
Other	<input type="checkbox"/>

### Outcome Comments

NA

### What are the cost savings associated with this committee?

Checked if Applies

None	<input type="checkbox"/>
Unable to Determine	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Under \$100,000	<input type="checkbox"/>
\$100,000 - \$500,000	<input type="checkbox"/>
\$500,001 - \$1,000,000	<input type="checkbox"/>
\$1,000,001 - \$5,000,000	<input type="checkbox"/>
\$5,000,001 - \$10,000,000	<input type="checkbox"/>
Over \$10,000,000	<input type="checkbox"/>
Cost Savings Other	<input type="checkbox"/>

### Cost Savings Comments

NIH supported basic and clinical research accomplishments often take many years to unfold into new diagnostic tests and new ways to treat and prevent diseases.

### What is the approximate Number of recommendations produced by this committee for the life of the committee?

5,562

### Number of Recommendations Comments

Grant Review - This is the number of applications reviewed by the Initial Review Group for FY2003 through FY2018.

### What is the approximate Percentage of these recommendations that have been or will be Fully implemented by the agency?

0%

**% of Recommendations Fully Implemented Comments**

NIH Peer Review Committees are involved in the initial review of research grant applications. The NIH dual peer review system is mandated by statute in accordance with section 492 of the Public Health Service Act. The charge to this committee is to determine scientific and technical merit of the individual grants or contracts. These recommendations are forwarded to Federal officials who generally accept the committee's recommendations and favorable applications are then forwarded for the second level of review performed by Institute and Center (IC) National Advisory Councils or Boards. Only applications that are favorably recommended by both the initial peer review committee and the Advisory Council may be recommended for funding.

**What is the approximate Percentage of these recommendations that have been or will be Partially implemented by the agency?**

0%

**% of Recommendations Partially Implemented Comments**

NIH Peer Review Committees are involved in the initial review of research grant applications. The NIH dual peer review system is mandated by statute in accordance with section 492 of the Public Health Service Act. The charge to this committee is to determine scientific and technical merit of the individual grants or contracts. These recommendations are forwarded to Federal officials who generally accept the committee's recommendations and favorable applications are then forwarded for the second level of review performed by Institute and Center (IC) National Advisory Councils or Boards. Only applications that are favorably recommended by both the initial peer review committee and the Advisory Council may be recommended for funding.

**Does the agency provide the committee with feedback regarding actions taken to implement recommendations or advice offered?**

Yes ☐ No ☐ Not Applicable ☒

**Agency Feedback Comments**

NA

**What other actions has the agency taken as a result of the committee's advice or recommendation?**

Checked if Applies

Reorganized Priorities

☐

Reallocated resources	<input type="checkbox"/>
Issued new regulation	<input type="checkbox"/>
Proposed legislation	<input type="checkbox"/>
Approved grants or other payments	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Other	<input type="checkbox"/>

### Action Comments

An action of “approved” or “recommended” for grants receiving initial peer review by this committee does not infer that the grant will be or has been funded. Research grant applications submitted to NIH must go through a two-step review process that includes the initial peer review for scientific and technical merit and a second step of review and approval by a National Advisory Council for program relevance. In addition, prior to an award or funding being made, NIH staff must conduct an administrative review for a number of other considerations. These include alignment with NIH’s funding principles, review of the project budget, assessment of the applicant’s management systems, determination of applicant eligibility, and compliance with public policy requirements. After all these steps have been completed, NIH officials make funding decisions on individual grant applications.

### Is the Committee engaged in the review of applications for grants?

Yes

What is the estimated <b>Number</b> of grants reviewed for approval	106
What is the estimated <b>Number</b> of grants recommended for approval	106
What is the estimated <b>Dollar Value</b> of grants recommended for approval	\$88,629,030

### Grant Review Comments

These numbers reflect the total number of applications considered (both scored and unscored) and the dollar amount requested in FY2018. The committee does not make a recommendation for approval.

### How is access provided to the information for the Committee's documentation?

Checked if Applies

Contact DFO	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Online Agency Web Site	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Online Committee Web Site	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Online GSA FACA Web Site	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Publications	<input type="checkbox"/>
Other	<input type="checkbox"/>

**Access Comments**

N/A